



2008219.01

BEREA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Tuesday, March 3, 2009

In Attendance

J. GrosseBusiness Manager
R. King.....GPD Associates
Planning Committee Per Sign-In Sheet

Distribution

All in Attendance
M. Salopek.....GPD Associates

The following is a brief list of items discussed:

- After introductions, R. King presented a brief overview of the process to be followed during the design of the project. He also explained how the space and budget had initially been determined for planning purposes for the project but emphasized that the number of rooms, allocation of spaces etc. was dependent upon the District's input.
- J. Grosse explained that the District's participation in the Ohio Schools Facilities Commission (OSFC) program and how the co-funding worked. It is noted that participation in the program means that the standards of the OSFC need to be followed. It was also to be noted that the costs of anything over and above the OSFC standards would be required to be 100% funded by the District. Initial discussions with the Administration had indicated that some changes would be required, such as increasing the size of the Media Center and Gymnasium.
- R. King showed a PowerPoint presentation which showed some examples of OSFC co-funded buildings and elaborated on the standards which would be applicable to the proposed facility.
- R. King also showed how the size of the proposed building had been determined to fit on the current Fairwood Elementary site and emphasized that this was only an initial concept which had been prepared for planning purposes.
- Discussion followed on various aspects:
 - Performance space – it was suggested that because of the strong music program in the District, a performance space be provided – perhaps an Auditorium for approximately 500 people? A stage was definitely required for performances and it was noted that one music room would probably not suffice.



- Vehicular access – noted that the provision of parking on the site was extremely important and that the 96 parking bays indicated would probably not be enough. A suggestion would be to possibly provide some overflow parking ability on the soccer field. J. Grosse indicated that perhaps the Board of Education site could be considered as an adjunct space for parking/parents' waiting etc. A suggestion was made to perhaps relocate the soccer field to the Board site as this field was not used much by Elementary students. Special Education had concerns about the distance of the main entry from the drop-off.
- Sustainable design – R. King explained that participation in the OSFC program would mean that the building would have to be LEED Silver certified. If certification was achieved, the OSFC would increase the project budget by 3% to cover the additional costs of the steps necessary to achieve certification. Nevertheless, GPD had a commitment to sustainable design and would be happy to include such elements as geothermal heating and cooling, solar panels etc. In answer to a question, R. King responded that the cost of solar panels is extremely high at the moment. GPD designs, as a matter of course, typically include large amounts of natural light with daylight and motion sensors to shut off artificial lights when not required.
- Planning models – a question was asked as to how the building would be planned – whether in pods or typical double-loaded corridor arrangement. Associated with this question were others related to shape of the room, how flexible the spaces could be, possibilities for larger rooms, linking rooms, spaces to facilitate innovative learning and teaming, distance learning/webinars etc. In response, R. King explained the standards for the OSFC program and some of the features of the rooms – including the technology, furniture, casework etc. – but emphasized that the layout would be done in conjunction with the Committee when it transitions into design. One member of the Committee cautioned that perhaps the design should be such as to not create inequity in the District. Counter to this were the thoughts that the design should be not just for the present but rather for the future and that the design should perhaps provide the vision for the District.
- General concerns – these included:
 - § the 850-student size of the school (it was however felt by some that this was not too big at all),
 - § the fact that the building fit in terms of the aesthetics,
 - § possible use by the community not only of the Gymnasium but other spaces as well (R. King explained the Akron model where the Gymnasium, Cafeteria, Media Center and at least 2 classrooms were accessible after-hours for use by the community),
 - § security (R. King explained the typical model where visitors are required to pass through the office before entering the school),
 - § adequate storage,
 - § a large space for motor exercise,



- § the District's proposed determination regarding Pre-School and the spaces that would be required to accommodate this,
- § acoustics (not only for the music spaces but also to cut down on noise throughout the building),
- § materials to be selected should not support allergies,
- § provide computer floor boxes in the Kindergarten rooms so as to free up wall space.
- Special Education – concerns included what programs were to be provided at the new building (and would these include gifted programs?), size and number of rooms, bathrooms, changing tables, accessible playground.
- R. King provided a questionnaire to be completed by the teachers for some input on the classrooms. The handout included some of the typical spaces per the OSFC program and the features typically provided in each. R. King pointed out that in this process communication is key and the more information provided to him by the Committee, the better understanding he would have of the requirements for the new building.
- The next meeting will be Thursday, March 5, 2009, at 4:00 p.m. At this meeting more detail of the numbers and sizes of the rooms will be shared with the Committee.

The preceding is GPD Associates interpretation of the meeting. Any changes, additions, or clarifications should be forwarded to our office as soon as possible. Unless these changes are furnished within ten (10) working days, it will be understood that all parties are in agreement with the preceding statements.

Respectfully submitted,
GPD Associates
Architects&Engineers&Planners
520 South Main Street, Suite 2531
Akron, Ohio 44311-1010
(330) 572-2100 - Phone (330) 572-2102 – Fax